

Note on the Double Star H I. 62. By S. W. Burnham, Esq.

The place of No. 62 of Sir William Herschel's Class I. is given in the Synopsis of his Catalogues (*Memoirs of the R.A.S.*, vol. xxxv.) for 1880, as :

$$\text{R.A.} = 20^{\text{h}} 58^{\text{m}}.8.$$

$$\text{Decl.} = +6^{\circ} 17'.6.$$

No measures of distance are recorded; but the angle was measured twice, $234^{\circ}.8$ in 1783.4, and $237^{\circ}.1$ in 1802.8. In the course of a search for the double stars of Herschel's Class I., not found in *Mensurae Micrometricae*, this was carefully looked for several times in and near the assigned place, but nothing of the kind could be found; and I became satisfied that in this, as in many other pairs previously identified, there was a considerable error in the place. It has since occurred to me that this is probably identical with No. 269 of my Fifth Catalogue of New Double Stars (*Monthly Notices*, November 1874), there being an error of 1° in Herschel's declination. The place of the new pair (1880) is :—

$$\text{R.A.} = 20^{\text{h}} 58^{\text{m}} 39^{\text{s}}.$$

$$\text{Decl.} = +7^{\circ} 19' 6''.$$

Baron Dembowski has measured this on three nights, giving a mean result (1875.1), $P = 251^{\circ}.0$; $D = 1''.11$. The direct motion indicated by the two observations of Herschel would make the position-angle about 245° in 1875. As the pair is somewhat difficult, a small error in either of the single measures would fully account for this slight discrepancy. As similar mistakes in declination are not unfrequent in the lists of both Herschels, it may be considered as almost beyond doubt that these two pairs are identical. A continued advance in the angle will settle the question. There remains but one pair not yet accounted for of Herschel's Class I.

Chicago,
1877, January 23.

On the Magnitude of η Argús. By J. Tebbutt, Esq.

In the *Monthly Notices*, vol. xxxi., p. 211, was published a series of comparisons of η Argús made by me, and extending from July 1854 to the end of 1870. The following results are to be regarded as a continuation of that series, the comparison stars being contained in the Catalogue on page 42 of Sir J. Herschel's *Results of Astronomical Observations at the Cape of Good Hope*,

1834-8, and embraced in the same field of view with η *Argûs*. It appears that η *Argûs* has diminished only about half a magnitude since 1870.

	Dates of the Comparisons.	Mean Date of Com- parisons.	Mean of Concluded Mags.
1871	Jan. 14, 25, Feb. 13, March 20, April 3, 22, May 3, 16, 31, June 29 }	1871.26	6.37
1871	July 13, 14, 28, Aug. 31, Oct. 16, Nov. 25, Dec. 13, 29 }	1871.74	6.44
1872	Jan. 16, Feb. 20, March 8, April 5, May 9, 20, June 21, July 23, Aug. 20, Dec. 10 }	1872.40	6.49
1873	Feb. 4, 18, March 21, April 7, 22, 23, 24, May 1, 26, June 5, July 12, Aug. 5 }	1873.32	6.55
1874	Jan. 16, Feb. 18, March 19, April 17, May 13, 15, 21, 23, June 13, July 16, Nov. 19, Dec. 28 }	1874.42	6.58
1875	Jan. 28, March 19, May 13, 22, July 5, Aug. 17, Nov. 30, Dec. 18 }	1875.50	6.70
1876	June 17, 24, March 13, May 11, July 3, Aug. 31, Sept. 18, Nov. 21, Dec. 28 }	1876.44	6.70

Windsor, N. S. Wales,
1877, January 10.

On the Nomenclature of Meteor Radiant Points.

By J. W. Backhouse.

The proper naming of meteor showers is a subject of some importance, on account of the confusion that must result if unsuitable names are given to them. It therefore appears to me that it should not be left to individual astronomers to give names, or we shall have such ones as are found in the January Number of the *Monthly Notices*, pp. 108-111. In that paper there are several cases in which two different showers are called by the same name; and we find such names as *Taurids I.*, *Taurids II.*, *Leonids Minor*, &c.

I would suggest that the nomenclature of radiant points should be placed in charge of the British Association Committee on Luminous Meteors; though I do not know what foreign astronomers would say to this, seeing that they might be inclined to adopt the English names, or similar ones, on condition of their being suitably chosen. It is probably not needful that many showers should be named; but it seems most suitable that whoever wishes to have any named should communicate with that Committee.